G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1909
(Inwrai)

File No. 63

Serial Nos. 1 to 7

Papers Filed.

Month May 1910.

SUBJECT.

Passing orders regarding the archakships of Sri Ranganathaswami and other temples at Kulli Village in the Kunigal Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Mag. 7. 295—11.

Examined

Recorded.

1] 1909.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Mudras)

NOTES.

File No. 63-09

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of the temple at Hutkaru, Hutkandroog, Kunigal Taluk.

From

Poojaru S Rangiah

No.	Dated	Received
Diary No. 216	Enclos. –	Spare Copies – Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

(1873) Appeals against the Dy Commrs order directing the restoration of Achayah to the Archakship of the temple

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Hr. Secretary's order: Put up note

Submitted for orders

AG 29/7/09

50 Submitted to Secd Commr

The petrs request that pending disposal of the appeal execution of the Dy Comrs order may be stayed.

15/8 2.8.09.

Notes—First sheet

GPB—30,000—3-1-07

S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mis File No. 63 of 1909

Serial No.

He seems to have displaced somebody else recently. So no particular hardship if D.C's order is carried out.

Call for a report with proceedings.

3/8/09

Asst Secy

5/8/1909

5/8/1909

4/8/09

5/8/09

5/8/09

2 To, The Dy Comm: Tumkur dis: U.O. no 390 Dt 7.8.09

Forwards Sl 1 for report

3 From, The Same officer

Letter Dt 20.10.09.

Submits report called for in Sl 2 together with the records of enquiry

The records relating to the appointment of Resht Achayya in 1894 have not been received Draft calling for the same submitted.

Submitted

Sl 3 15/11/09 15/11/09

Dsane 15/11/1909

4 To, The Dy Comm: Tumkur dis: Docket no 1248 Dt 17.11.1909

Calls for the records relating to

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—18-5-08

[12-]
and Revenue
cretariat.

File No. 63 of 1909

Serial No.

The appointment of Resht Achaiah in 1897

5 From, the Dy. Commr, Tumkur Dt.
Letter no 442 Dy 20.1.1910.

Reports that the records refd in Sl 4 are not forthcoming and submits extracts from "Mons and Jo" register relating thereto

Submitted for orders
BV
25-1-1910 M

Under-Secretary's note.—

The following are the admitted facts in this case —

(1) that Coumden-petta Achaiyya was appointed Pujari about 1895 and continued till 1899 his appointment having been approved in 1897 by the Asstt Commr in charge of the Taluk.

(2) that in 1899 he went away to Kunigal

(3) that during his absence one Rangiah the foster-son of Ranganna of the Shekdar's family performed Puje for a few months, and

(4) that he also went away and appellant was asked to perform Puje which he is still doing.

BPG—35,000—27-1-09

19

Inwd File No. 63 of 1909

Serial No.

On 23rd June 1902 the Patel submitted a report for the confirmation of appellant. In the course of the enquiry respondent said he went away in 1899 on account of his daughter's illness, asking Rangiah to do the duties for him, that when he came back after a short time the people said he should not enter the village as he came from a plague infected place, that his subsequent requests to be restored were not complied with and that the villagers after driving away his nominee appointed appellant Rangaya to perform Puje. Respt requested that he might be restored. The villagers urged that respondent had executed a karar resigning his place and that they appointed their own man. The Amildar held an enquiry in the course of which it was elicited that there were two factions in the village each supporting one of the claimants. The Karar alleged to have been executed by respondent was produced. He denied execution; but admitted

Ship A
(D/ 26-4-1899)

B
(Deposition D/ 19.12.02 before the Amildar)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

That his signature was taken by force to a document written by the Patel of Ankwagot. The appellant said he would obey the orders of Govt in the matter of respondent's restoration. Amildar on 30th Sept 1904 ordered that the Villagers had no business to appoint a Bujari and that Achuah should be restored The appellant would not allow this to be executed and appealed to the Dy. Commr. The matter was again enquired into and the confirmation of the first order was recommended It was found that respondent was occasionally worshipping the idols and the hakdars had given up their right. The Dy Commr confirmed the Amildar's order The chief grounds of appeal to Govt are:—

(1) That respot being out of office should be directed to file a regular suit, and

(2) That the respot having relinquished the office cannot get it back

This is perhaps a case [illegible]

C
Deposition Dy 15.12.02 before the Mamlatdar)

8
Vide memo)

LE,
Mahajan's Dy 8-5-08)

7 & 7,
Petition and Deposition 7 8-11-05 & 15 12 05
Dy
order Dy 23.6.09)

Y. Flag 4)

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

(6

Revenue retariat.

Serial No.

Revenue File No. 63 of 1909

(Had 9)
No. 44 of 1902)

and in which precedent ~~would~~ can be found. Now is however a decision of ours in a similar case by which ~~the appellant~~ is in favour of an appellant seeking ground is found appellant. The only difference is that in this case the first respondent showed his face some 2½ years after the decree while in the present case there is only an interval of three years.

The appellant's petition are therefore admitted & Issue Notice

344

Admitted
4/2/10

See Kattadaka of Achaya. 26 Apl 1899
C. Patel did not ask for restoration till 1902 (18.12.1902)
Patel's reply d 23.6.1902 to Taluka - about Kattadaka by Achaya -

Issue Notice to Achchayas.
The order of Dy Co^n need not be executed till this petn is disposed of.
2/2/10

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

R.S. 13]

Aug 03 - 09 1

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Submitted with a copy as ordered

NW 3/10

Isaac Long

Shewn with SD 3/12/1910 acknowledgment

SD 3/12/1910

Submitted NW 4.2.10

Sir J. AV

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GPB—45,000—19-5 08

Serial No.

Adjourned to the 18th instant, as the Councillor is otherwise engaged.

4/3/10

4/3/1910

Advt (Rangayya -
mr Appa Rau Adv.)

Respts (Achchanna -
mr Seshachari Adv.)

Order reserved -

17/3/10

Order

Notice to the appellant & the respondent that any hereditary right to the office. The respondent was duly appointed by the Asst Commr, and the widow of the previous pujari acquiesced in the appointment. He is alleged

Serial No.

to have resigned the post by a Kattadaka executed in favour of the villagers on 26th 1899. This document was not produced by the patel (who is opposed to the respondent) till 1902, when the respondent (Achayya) applied to get back the office. Its execution is not proved, and though the latter admits that he signed a paper under the patel's pressure, he does not admit the execution of this particular document.

The appellant was brought in by the patel and installed in the place; but the appointment was never sanctioned by the proper authority. As between the two, the respondent who has been properly appointed by the Revenue Amildar and whose

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

ue

File No. 63 of 190

Serial No.

appointment has been sanctioned by the Dy Cr has the better right to retain the office. There is no reason why the appellant should be allowed to resist the restoration, or why ~~the~~ he should be ordered to file a regular suit. In fact, in cases as in this case, the respondent does not claim the office by any hereditary title, a regular suit would be out of place altogether.

This appeal is therefore dismissed. The order of the Dy Cr may be enforced by ousting the appellant & placing the respondent in possession.

There are certain items in the file which allege that the respondent was not doing the duties of the office

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,0.81—27-4-09

Revenue etariat. | File No. 63 of 1909

Serial No.

properly. This order does not of course prevent the Dy Cr from investigating such Complaints, and passing such orders as may be called for, even to the extent of displacing the trustees if necessary & expedient.

12/4/1910. H. Manjunadayya

Dr

Draft as — 19.4.1910

AO

Submitted with Dfs

AO 20.4.10

20/4/10

Revise. Let this order be in the form of a decision finding the facts of the case & setting out the directions as long you become time I should have dictated this order.

30/4/1910

AO

Revised draft submd.

RB 9.5.10

Issue

9/5/1910

7

To. The Deputy Commr. Tumkur Dirte No 2756 dt 17.5.10

Passing orders regarding the archakship of Sri Ranganathaswamy and other temples at Hutri village in the Kunigal Taluk.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

19 ನೇ 19 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ,

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ,

ಮಾ।। ರಾ।। ವರಿಗೆ.

ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮ

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಂಬರ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕೆ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಕಿಲ್ಲು ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಆಗುವ ದಾವಾ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬತು ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುವದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರ್ ನಾಮ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ೪೨೫ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಪೂರ್ಣ ಕೀಸರಿ ಮಚ್ಚಿ ಬಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಶೆಟ್ಟರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ.

THE STANDARD PRESS, BANGALORE

No. 390 dtd 1/8/09

Muz.3] M.7.63-09-2

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 216

dated 26.7.09 received at this
Office from Poojari S Rangiah
of Huttavidoong, Kunigal Tk.
appealing against the Dy
Commr's order regarding the
Archakship of the temple
at the place, — —

is forwarded, together with its one
enclosure$, to the Dy Commr,
Tumkur Distt, for favour
of ~~enquiry and~~ report
with proceedings. ~~early~~

By Order,

Cr's order)
Dtd 5/8/09

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

BANGALORE,
1909

5/8/09

GP —1500—20 Io 07

(3)

-3.

With reference to his Review- petition registered no D 216 Dt 26th July 1909 presented on behalf of S. Rangayah, ~~Pujari~~ Pujari, ~~Hattaram~~ Huttarudoorg, Kunigal Taluk, Mr. I Appu Rao, Advocate, is informed that the petition has been forwarded for report ~~with Proceedings~~ to the Dy. Commr, Tumkur Dist. Enclosing the Dy Commr's order copy to be returned

By order,
S. S. W. S.
for Secretary.

Dft)

Ø 820

190 Mysr 63-09-3.

From The Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District.

To The Secretary to the

Government of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments

(Inwards)

Dated 20th. October 1909.

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No. 1 file &

1 petition.

Submits a report re the appeal preferred to Government against the order appointing Achaiya for the archakship of Sri Rangasvami and other temples of Hutri in the Kunigal Taluq.

Refer
AE
confirm note
by return

4)

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District.

Dated 20th.October 1909.

From K.Doraswami Iyer Esqr.,

Deputy Commissioner.

To K.S.Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esqr.,B.A.,L.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your Official memo No. 390/F.C.03-09-2 dated the 7th.August 1909 forwarding for report a petition for Pujari S.Rangaiya of Kutri village in the Kunigal taluk, re the archakship of the Sri Ranganathaswami and other temples at the place, I have the honour to state that on the death of Pujari Ranganaiya in the year Dhata (1870-7) without issue, Annamma (Rangaiya's widow) and the villagers entrusted one Achaiya of Kunigal with the duties of archakship in the year 1890,and this arrangement was tentatively sanctioned in August 1897 by the then Extra Assistant Commissioner. From the perusal of the records, it would appear that Achaiya,having asked one Rangaiya(Annamma's sister's son) to do puja during his absence, went to Kunigal in 1899 to see his daughter who was stricken with Plague. After a period of about 3 months, the Patel and the villagers having ousted Ranganaiya,Achaiya's nominee brought another Ranganaiya from Satanur in the Magadi taluk and unauthorisedly kept him for puja work. When Achaiya turned up for work in 1902, he was kept out by the villagers headed by the Patel on the plea of a kattadeka, purporting to his having relinquished the office, said to have been executed by him in April 1899 in favour

statemont before the Amildar in 1902. On the Patel's first report in June 1902 for Satanur Rangaiya's ~~confirm~~ confirmation long after his entertainment as archak, the Amildar after examining all parties concerned ordered in September 1904 the reinstatement of Achaiya and the restoration of inam lands to him, which were then clandestinely being enjoyed by the Patel. On a petition presented to this office by Satanur Rangaiya against this order, the records were called for ; but the successive Amildars, after necessary enquiries recommended the confirmation of the order passed in 1904 by their predecessor in office. On a perusal of the records, I came to the conclusion that the Patel and the villagers had no right to keep Achaiya out and that the Patel assumed to himself the power of appointing Pujaries as per his admission before the Amildar in 1902. Then I ordered the restoration of Achaiya and suspended the Patel pending his explanation. It is against the restoration of Archak Achaiya that the appeal is preferred before Government by the petitioner

2. The Patel has declined to obey the order of suspension and it is reported that some men of his party assaulted the Shekdar in his attempt to carry out the order. The Amildar has taken no steps to have the order obeyed and the Sub Divisional Officer has been asked to take needful steps.

3. The records are sent herewith. The petition of appeal is also returned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

For Deputy Commissioner.

MRD

G.R.S. 29A]

6

190 .

From

15/11/09

Secy. to the Govt of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy Commr

Tumkur Dist

Dated

Despatched

Received 14th Nov 1909.

General No. 1248

No. M. 7 63-09-4

Enclosure No. 1 Jig & 1 Petn

Adverting to his letter dated 20th October 1909 reporting on the appeal petition of Rangiah of Huten Village in the Kunigal Taluk re the Archakship of Sri Rangaswamy and other temples at the place has the honor to observe that the records relating to

of Respt

Achayya in 1897 have not
been received and to request
that the same may kindly
be submitted for reference

2) The rem. records
are herewith returned for
ref. and re-submn

By order,

(Sd)

for Secretary

W Nellore

Reference 13/4/1960

D 1309

Reg 63-09-5

Before the Munsif Secretary
with the Government of
Mysore, Bangalore

Appellant.

S. Ranjiah
Poojari of Huthuri
Ranganatha Swamy
temple, Huthridoorg
Hobly. Kunigal Taluk.

Respondent

Achaiah
C/- Poojari
Kunigal town.

The appellant respectfully begs to state as follows:—

I That he filed an appeal against the ex parte decision of the lower court, Tumkur District on or about the 26th July last.

II That this Honorable Court after admitting the said appeal called for the records from Tumkur. Ex-Commissioner.

III That the respondent

Ltd 2

9)

the merits of the claims
the appellant or

IV The respondent does not
come from the Hukdar family
and is further estopped
by his written relinquishment
of any right he might have
to the office in question
as well as by his objectionable
conduct.

V That wherefore appellant
prays that he might be
permitted to continue in
office pending disposal
of the [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

11 hrs 1/10 1907 10 7

From The Deputy Commissioner
Dyn Kur District
D 1395

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Genl and Rev Depts
Mysore Bracket
Bangalore

Dated 20 Jan
Despatched 24 } January 1910.
Received

General No. 444
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Forwards records Connected with the Archakship of Srikantaswami and other temples at Hubli Kumigal Taluk

refer
AV
25/1/10
AV

10)

Office

20th January 1910

From

K. Doraswami Iyer Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Tanjore District

To.

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer Esq BA
Offg Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Jeneral and Revenue Depts
(Amrai)

Sir,

Adverting to your docket no 1248 m.F. 63-09-4 dated 17th November last, requesting to send the records relating to the appointment of Achaiya as Archak of Sri Rangaswami and other temples at Hutri, Kunigal Taluk, in the year 1897, I have the honor to state that the Amildar reports in his no 265 dated 11th instant, that the records referred to are not forthcoming and that the extracts from the "From and To" Registers relating to the case I have therefore been enclosed.

2. The Amildar's report together with the records received with the docket under reply is herewith resubmitted

I have the honor to be,
Sir
your most obedient servant,

19

G.R.S. 31]

No. 1948

From M-7-63-09

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Depts.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District.

Dated Bangalore, the 3rd February 190

Genl. and Rev
Secretariat

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.442 dated 20th January 1910 submitting the records connected with the Archakship of Sri Ranganaswamy and other temples at Nutri in the Kunigal Taluk, I am directed to request that execution of the order passed by you, ~~should be stayed~~ if it has not already been carried out, may be suspended till the appeal is disposed of.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

For Offg: Secretary to Govt.

GPB—4,000—12-5-09

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1909 1910 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ,

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ,

ಮಾ ರಾ ವರಿಗೆ.

ಬರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಂಬರ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಸರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ವಿವಾದಿ, ಫೈನಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಕಿಲ್ಲ್ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಸಹ ಪಡಮಕೊಂಡು ರಸೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಆಗುವ ದಾವಾ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಪ್ರೊಸೆಸ್ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬತು ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ದಸ್ತ್ಯವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಹ ಈಮೂಲಕ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದಷ್ಟಿರು ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲೂ ಇರಿಸುವ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇರ್ಪೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ-1910 } ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ರುಜು.

ಈ ವೊಕ್ಕಾಲ್ತ್‌ನಾಮ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿ ರುವದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ ಇರ್ಪೇನೆ.

ಈ ವೊಕ್ಕಾಲ್ತ್‌ನಾಮ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದೇನೆ.

☞ ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಕಛೇರಿ ರೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ~~ಐರಿಷ್~~ ಪ್ರೆಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರಿಯುತ್ತೆ.

The Irish Press, Bangalore City

175

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

~~Appeal~~ File No. 63 of 1902

Appellant.

Sakanur Rangiah

Respondent.

Achiah

SUBJECT.

Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswamy and other Temples at Hutri Village in the Kunigal Taluk.

Facts of the Case

One Bujani Rangiah was the Archak of Sri Ranganathaswamy and other Temples at Hutri Village, Kunigal Taluk. After his death in the year Dhatu (1876-7) without issue, his widow Ranganna and the villagers entrusted

in the year 1895, one
with the duties of Archak, and this
ment was tentatively sanctioned in
August 1897 by the Assistant Commr. in
charge of the Taluk. Achiah left the
place for Kunigal in 1899 having asked
Ramganna's sister's son Rangiah to perform
worship during his absence. His Rangiah
also left went away and the Villagers appointed
one Sadanna Rangiah as Pujari and
requested in 1902 that ~~Sadanna Rangiah~~ he
should be confirmed. In the course of
the enquiry Achiah appeared and said
that he went away in 1899 on account
of his daughter's illness, asking Rangiah
to do the duties for him, that when he
came back after a short time the people
said he should not enter the village
as he came from a plague-infected
place, that his subsequent requests
to be restored were not complied with

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

away his nominee appondee appellant. S Rangiah to perform Puje and prayed that he might be restored. The Villagers said that Heliah (respdt) before leaving in 1899 executed a Kabala relinquishing the office and that therefore he should not be restored. The Amildar after holding an exhaustive enquiry ordered in Septr 1904 the re-instatement of Heliah and the restoration of the temple lands to him. This order was confirmed in appeal by the Dy. Commr. Against the Dy. Comrs. order, Rangiah has appealed To Government. The case was heard before Govt on the 17th March 1910, the contending parties being present in person and represented by Advocates also.

order.

Neither the appellant nor the respdt has any hereditary right to the office

MGC PB— 0000—5-10-

16

16

The respt was duly appointed by the Asst Commr and the widow of the previous Pujari acquiesced in the appointment. He is alleged to have resigned the post by a Kabuliyat executed in favor of the villagers on 26th April 1899 This document was not produced by the Patel (who is opposed to the respt) till 1902, when the respt (Achiah) applied to get back the office. Its execution is not proved and though the latter admits that he signed a paper under the Patel's pressure, he does not admit the execution of this particular document.

The aplt was brought in by the Patel and installed in the place; but the appointment was never sanctioned by the proper authority. As between the two, the respt who has been properly appointed by the Amildar and whose appointment has been sanctioned by the Dy. Commr has the better right to retain the

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

office. There is no reason why the applt should be allowed to resist his restoration, or why he should be ordered to file a regular suit. In fact, where, as in this case, the respt does not claim the office by any hereditary title, a regular suit would be out of place altogether.

This appeal is therefore dismissed. The order of the Dy. Commr may be enforced by ousting the appellant and placing the respt in possession.

There are certain petitions on the file which allege that the respt was not doing the duties of the office properly. This order does not of course prevent the Dy. Commr from investigating such complaints, and passing such orders as may be called for, even to the extent of displacing the respt if necessary and expedient

Exd. D. C.

27/5/[illegible]

Copy to the Dy. Commr for [illegible].

MGCPB—50000—7-10

18

Commr, Dumka Divn,
returning the records
received with his letter
No. 442 dt 29-3 June 1910.

D(A)

87
7/5/1910

Submitted.

Jr Secretary.

May this order
be printed?

SV
9.5.10 Smith

Copies to Mr Appu Rau,
Advocate for the aplt
and Mr Sethadian, Advocate
for the respt

* No 2755 dt 17 5 1910.
(+) No 2756 dt 17.5 1910.

1909-10

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 17th May 1910

No. 2754 Muz. 63-09

Passing orders regarding the archakship of Sri Ranganathaswami and other temples at Hutri village in the Kunigal Taluk.

GPB—1 6 10—200

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

APPEAL No. OF 19

Appellant	*Vs.*	*Respondent*
Satanur Rangiah		Achiah.

Subject.

Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswami and other temples at Hutri village in the Kunigal Taluk.

Facts of the case.

One Pujari Rangiah was the archak of Sri Ranganathaswami and other temples at Hutri village, Kunigal Taluk. After his death in the year Dhatu (1876-7 without issue, his widow Rangamma and the villagers entrusted, in the year 1895), one Achiah of Kunigal with the duties of archak, and this arrangement was tentatively sanctioned in August 1897 by the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the taluk. Achiah left the place for Kunigal in 1899, having asked Rangamma's sister's son Rangiah to perform worship during his absence This Rangiah also went away and the villagers appointed one Satanur Rangiah as pujari and requested in 1902 that he should be confirmed. In the course of the enquiry, Achiah appeared and said that he went away in 1899, on account of his daughter's illness, asking Rangiah to do the duties for him, that when he came back after a short time the people said he should not enter the village as he came from a plague-infected place, that his subsequent requests to be restored were not complied with and that the villagers after driving away his nominee appointed appellant S. Rangiah to perform puje, and prayed that he might be restored. The villagers said that Achiah (respondent) before leaving in 1899 executed a karar relinquishing the office and that therefore he should not be restored. The Amildar after holding an exhaustive enquiry ordered in September 1904 the re-instatement of Achiah and the restoration of the temple lands to him. This order was confirmed in appeal by the Deputy Commissioner. Against the Deputy Commissioner's order, Rangiah has appealed to Government. The case was heard before Government on the 17th March 1910, the contending parties being present in person and represented by advocates also.

Order.

Neither the appellant nor the respondent has any hereditary right to the office. The respondent was duly appointed by the Assistant Commissioner and the widow of the previous pujari acquiesced in the appointment. He is alleged to have resigned the post by a Kattadaka executed in favor of the villagers on 26th April 1899. This document was not produced by the patel (who is opposed to the respondent) till 1902, when the respondent (Achiah) applied to get back the office. Its execution is not proved, and though the latter admits that he signed a paper under the patel's pressure, he does not admit the execution of this particular document.

The appellant was brought in by the patel and installed in the place; but the appointment was never sanctioned by the proper authority. As between the two, the respondent, who has been properly appointed by the Amildar and whose appointment has been sanctioned by the Deputy Commissioner, has the better right to retain the office. There is no reason why the appellant should be allowed to resist his restoration, or why he should be ordered to file a regular suit. In fact, where, as in this case, the respondent does not claim the office by any hereditary title, a regular suit would be out of place altogether.

This appeal is therefore dismissed. The order of the Deputy Commissioner may be enforced by ousting the appellant and placing the respondent in possession.

Muzrai, dated 17th May 1910.

There are certain petitions on the file which allege that the respondent was not doing the duties of the office properly. This order does not, of course, prevent the Deputy Commissioner from investigating such complaints, and passing such orders as may be called for, even to the extent of displacing the respondent if necessary and expedient.

2754—MUZ. 63-09, DATED BANGALORE, 17TH MAY 1910.

Copy to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the records received with his letter No. 442, dated the 22nd January 1910.

Offg Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Exd. —C. V.